# UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF VERMONT

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

\*

V

\*

BRIAN FOLKS

\* CRIMINAL FILE NO. 16-94

JURY TRIAL
Tuesday, May 7, 2019
Burlington, Vermont

### **BEFORE:**

THE HONORABLE WILLIAM K. SESSIONS III District Judge

### APPEARANCES:

WILLIAM B. DARROW, ESQ., EMILY M. SAVNER, ESQ. and MATTHEW T. GRADY, ESQ., Assistant United States Attorneys, Federal Building, Burlington, Vermont; Attorneys for the United States

MARK J. KAPLAN, ESQ., Kaplan & Kaplan, Park Plaza, Suite 405, 95 St. Paul Street, Burlington, Vermont; Attorney for the Defendant

NATASHA SEN, ESQ., P.O. Box 193, Brandon, Vermont; Attorney; Attorney for the Defendant

ANNE NICHOLS PIERCE
Registered Professional Reporter
United States District Court Reporter - Retired
Post Office Box 5633
Burlington, Vermont 05402
(802) 793-9080

# I N D E X

## EXAMINATION

WITNESS NAME	PAGE	LINE
JENNIFER MARTIN		
Direct by Mr. Kaplan	7	16
CHRISSY T.		
Direct by Mr. Kaplan	9	23
Cross by Ms. Savner	16	24
Redirect by Mr. Kaplan	27	11
Recross by Ms. Savner	28	25
ANTHONY MARTINO		
Direct by Ms. Sen	31	12
Cross by Mr. Grady	76	13

### EXHIBITS

DEFENDANT'S	DESCRIPTION	IN EVIDENCE
Z55	Audio recording of Detective May interview with Chrissy T.	14

TUESDAY, MAY 7, 2019 1 (The following was held in open court without the jury 2 present at 1:15 p.m.) 3 THE COURT: Okay. The attorneys wanted to 4 speak with me; is that correct? 5 MR. KAPLAN: Well, Judge, I just had one brief 6 7 I was going to call Chrissy to the stand -- we 8 had subpoenaed her -- or Detective May, who we subpoenaed, to play a tape of when Detective Mann --9 Detective May and Chrissy and one other law enforcement 10 officer interviewed her in December sometime. And --11 but the thing I can't do up front is have them 12 authenticate it because they haven't listened to it. 13 So, I mean, we got it from the government, so we 14 have listened to it. So I can either have them listen 15 to it now before the jury comes in so they can say, yes, 16 that's the tape, or I can -- the government can just be 17 gracious and let us introduce it into evidence. 18 THE COURT: Is there a motion for a gracious 19 20 response by the government? Okay? MS. SAVNER: We don't object to the 21 authentication, but, your Honor, this is an audio 22 recorded interview with one of the government's 23 witnesses that was available to the defense when that 24

government witness testified.

25

They now want to introduce her prior out-of-court statement, and now they seem to want to do it without even having her on the stand and subject to cross examination on the statement, because they want to do it through the agent.

So we object to the audio recording being played at all given that it's hearsay and it's clearly being offered for its truth. They want to play the whole interview, and we object to it coming in through Chris May and not having the witness whose statement it is be available for cross examination.

THE COURT: Okay. So, first of all, was this set up during Ms. Tatro's cross examination?

MR. KAPLAN: No, but she is now our witness, and I can certainly call her and put her on the stand. And this tape recording has conversations that are directly related to things she said when she testified for the government.

MS. SAVNER: Not inconsistent.

MR. KAPLAN: Yes. She only has some inconsistent statements in it, for sure.

THE COURT: Well, I am going to let you put the statement on, but I would call her.

MR. KAPLAN: Okay.

THE COURT: She is here?

24

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

25

MR. KAPLAN: Yes, she is here. 1 THE COURT: Okay. You can call her, put her 2 I don't think it requires authentication. 3 on. MR. KAPLAN: All right. 4 THE COURT: Just play the tape, and the 5 6 government has the opportunity to cross examine. 7 MR. KAPLAN: Okay. And we have an exhibit 8 number for it? THE COURT: Okay. Then who else do you have? 9 MR. KAPLAN: I am going to call Jennifer 10 Martin first. 11 THE COURT: Okay. And then --12 MR. GRADY: Your Honor, if I may, just about 13 Jennifer Martin. I think that relates to Emily Lasell. 14 She admitted that she said the statement to Jennifer 15 Martin, so I am not sure why we have to call Jennifer 16 Martin. 17 THE COURT: Right, yeah. She did say that. 18 mean, I was wondering the same thing, frankly. She 19 20 acknowledged that the statement was made. MR. KAPLAN: Well, I asked her if she knew 21 whether or not Ayla was prostituting, and she said yes, 22 but she -- I think she said she didn't know how. And 23 what she told Jennifer was that she was doing it with 24 her -- that this witness was doing it with -- with --25

Ayla. 1 THE COURT: Oh, so that's the difference? 2 MR. KAPLAN: That's the significant 3 difference, I think. It's not left out there that she 4 sort of heard it or somebody had -- it was common 5 6 knowledge the fact that she said to our investigator 7 that she was doing it with Ayla. 8 THE COURT: All right. MR. GRADY: But that's what counsel asked her 9 if she said that to Jennifer Martin, and she said, "Yes, 10 I did," and then she clarified it. I don't have it in 11 front of me, but not -- you know, she qualified what she 12 13 said to Jennifer Martin with what she said in her testimony. 14 MR. KAPLAN: It's not the same. 15 THE COURT: So -- but if -- I am going to let 16 you call the -- it's going to be a two-minute witness, I 17 assume. 18 MR. KAPLAN: Yes. 19 20 THE COURT: If that -- if that is inconsistent -- yeah, I suppose it is inconsistent. 21 Okay. And your expert? 22 MR. KAPLAN: Yes. Hopefully he will go on 23 today at some point. 24 25 THE COURT: Okay. Right.

Okay, so ready for the jury? 1 MR. KAPLAN: Yes, Judge. 2 THE COURT: Okay. 3 (The following was held in open court with the jury 4 5 present at 1:24 p.m.) 6 THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Kaplan, you want to 7 call your next witness. 8 MR. KAPLAN: Your Honor, I would call Jennifer Martin to the stand. 9 10 JENNIFER MARTIN, having been duly sworn by the courtroom deputy, 11 was examined and testified as follows: 12 THE COURT: Good afternoon, Ms. Martin. 13 THE WITNESS: Hi. 14 DIRECT EXAMINATION 15 BY MR. KAPLAN: 16 Miss Martin, would you state your full name, 17 please. 18 It's Jennifer Martin. 19 20 And you live in Chittenden County? Α Yes. 21 And what is your profession? 22 I am a private investigator. 23 And were you retained by the defense to work on the 24 25 Brian Folks case that we're involved in right now?

```
Α
            Yes.
 1
            And as part of your responsibilities, were you
 2
       asked to meet with Emily Lasell?
 3
 4
       Α
            Yes.
            And did you meet with her?
 5
       Q
 6
       Α
            I did.
 7
            And you served her a subpoena?
 8
       Α
            I did.
 9
            And did you memorialize your conversation in a --
       in a report?
10
            I did.
       Α
11
            Let me show you what's been marked as Defendant's
12
       Q
13
       Exhibit Z56 and ask you if that's the report?
            That is my report.
       Α
14
            Where was it that you had this conversation with
15
16
       her?
            At Emily's workplace in Colchester.
       Α
17
18
            And she told you that she knew that Ayla was
       prostituting before she met Brian?
19
20
       Α
            Yes, she told me that.
            And did you ask her how she knew?
21
       Q
22
       Α
            Yes.
            And what did she say?
23
            She said she knew because she was doing it with
24
25
       Ayla.
```

ĺ	I
1	Q And this was before she met Brian?
2	A And she clarified that it was before she met Brian,
3	before 2015.
4	MR. KAPLAN: I have nothing further.
5	THE COURT: Okay. Any questions from the
6	government?
7	MR. GRADY: No, your Honor.
8	THE COURT: Okay. Thank you, Miss Martin.
9	THE WITNESS: Thank you.
10	(Witness excused.)
11	THE COURT: All right. The government call
12	the next witness.
13	MR. KAPLAN: Your Honor, I would call Chrissy
14	to the stand.
15	THE COURT: Is that Chrissy Tatro?
16	MR. KAPLAN: Yes.
17	CHRISSY T.,
18	having been duly sworn by the courtroom deputy,
19	was examined and testified as follows:
20	THE COURT: Good afternoon, Miss Tatro.
21	THE WITNESS: Good afternoon, Judge.
22	DIRECT EXAMINATION
23	BY MR. KAPLAN:
24	Q Would you state your full name, please.
25	A Chrissy Tatro.

```
And you were just out sitting with Detective May?
 1
 2
       Α
            Yes.
            And you heard the conversation about you and
 3
       Detective May having a conversation in his car?
 4
            I believe so, yes.
      Α
 5
 6
           And you remember that conversation?
 7
       Α
            No.
 8
            Okay. So I'm going to play defense Exhibit Z55 for
       you and see if you -- if this refreshes your memory.
 9
      Okay?
10
      Α
           Okay.
11
                 THE COURT: All right. So actually, are you
12
13
      broadcasting this --
                 MR. KAPLAN: We may have to do it outside the
14
      presence of the jury if it's just to refresh her memory.
15
16
       I wasn't going to play it so everyone could hear it.
                 THE COURT: I thought you were suggesting that
17
       this was an inconsistent statement, you set up that as
18
       an inconsistent statement. Then you'd play the video.
19
20
                 MR. KAPLAN: Well, actually she is our witness
       at this point, and I want to play a statement that she
21
22
      made that's consistent with some of her statements and
       inconsistent with others statements that she has
23
      previously done, but I --
24
25
                 THE COURT: Oh, all right.
                                            So --
```

MR. KAPLAN: I think we can ask her -- play a 1 tape where she was -- had a conversation with the police 2 about her involvement in this matter. 3 THE COURT: Okay. So how long is the tape? 4 MR. KAPLAN: 16 minutes. 5 THE COURT: Okay. Does the government have 6 7 any objection to just playing the tape and moving along 8 at that point? MS. SAVNER: The government does not object to 9 the authentication -- the authenticity of the tape. 10 However, as stated, the government does object. This is 11 hearsay. This is this witness's prior out-of-court 12 13 statements being offered for their truth, and they are identifying specific things that they are using to 14 15 impeach her prior testimony. THE COURT: Okay. Would counsel approach the 16 bench. 17 (The following was held at the bench.) 18 THE COURT: Okay. Let me just make sure I 19 20 understand exactly the purpose. I thought you were calling her to testify that she had made statements 21 perhaps inconsistent with what she said. 22 MR. KAPLAN: She definitely -- there are 23 definite misstatements on that disk that we do --24 25 THE COURT: Okay. And that's to impeach her

```
credibility --
1
                 MR. KAPLAN: Yeah. Just not --
 2
                 THE COURT: -- when she testified for the
 3
       government.
 4
                 MR. KAPLAN: Yes.
 5
                 THE COURT: Right? So you certainly can
 6
       introduce those statements.
 7
 8
                 MR. KAPLAN: But I want to play the tape,
      because she says -- for example, she says that she is
 9
       not afraid of our client and all of that, he would never
10
      hurt her, and she said the opposite when she was
11
      testifying. And there's other statements she made about
12
13
      her relationship to people, and since she is my witness,
       I think I ought to be able to play a --
14
                 THE COURT: Well, those are inconsistent
15
       statements.
16
                 MR. KAPLAN: Yeah, I --
17
                 THE COURT: Those are a series of inconsistent
18
       statements, right? You're --
19
20
                 MR. KAPLAN: Maybe not everything's an
       inconsistent statement, but --
21
                 THE COURT: Well, then I would think the
22
       government would want to introduce, I suppose, things
23
      which are --
24
25
                 MR. KAPLAN: I suppose -- that's fine.
```

```
THE COURT: So then my simple question is, if
 1
       you can put in the inconsistent statements by way of the
 2
       tape -- right? That's what you want to do?
 3
                 MR. KAPLAN: Yes.
 4
                 THE COURT: And the government would want to
 5
 6
       say -- introduce consistent statements consistent with
 7
       her truth in response to your introducing
 8
       conflicting statements --
                 MR. KAPLAN: That's fine.
 9
                 THE COURT: -- why don't we just play the
10
       tape?
11
                 MS. SAVNER: And the government will have the
12
13
       opportunity to cross examine her?
                 THE COURT: Oh, afterwards. Absolutely.
14
15
       Okay?
16
                 MR. KAPLAN: Okay.
                                     Thank you, Judge.
                 THE COURT: I think that's logically the way
17
       the evidence rules work. Okay.
18
       (The following was held in open court.)
19
20
                 THE COURT: So you are proposing to play the
       tape; is that correct?
21
22
                 MR. KAPLAN:
                              Yes.
                 THE COURT: And do you have it marked?
23
                 MR. KAPLAN: I do. It's marked as Defendant's
24
25
       Exhibit Z55.
```

```
THE COURT: Okay. I am going to admit that
 1
      tape, the simplest way of addressing both parties'
 2
       concerns, and then you can play the tape and then the
 3
       government has the opportunity to cross examine.
 4
                 MR. KAPLAN: Thank you, Judge.
 5
 6
                 THE COURT: Okay.
                 (Defendant's Exhibit Z55 was received in
 7
 8
       evidence.)
                 MS. SAVNER: Your Honor, we have it.
 9
      play it.
10
                 THE COURT: So no objection. All right. And
11
       I bet you have a running commentary underneath? Do you?
12
13
                 MS. SAVNER: We actually do not have that, no.
                 THE COURT: Oh, you don't?
14
                 MS. SAVNER: No.
15
                 THE COURT: Oh, all right. Okay.
16
            So is the government -- the government can play the
17
       tape.
18
                 MR. KAPLAN: Thank you, Judge.
19
20
                 (A digital recording was played in open
      court.)
21
22
      BY MR. KAPLAN:
            So in that conversation, you are talking with two
23
      police officers, right?
24
25
      Α
            Yes.
```

```
And you are speaking with two police officers who
 1
       you were working for?
 2
       Α
            Yes.
 3
            And they were paying you for your work?
 4
       Q
       Α
            Yes.
 5
 6
            And you had an interest of being honest with them,
 7
       right?
 8
       Α
            Yes.
            And you told them that Brian never used force.
 9
       never saw him hit anyone. Didn't you say that?
10
            I must -- I said it on the tape, yes.
11
            And you said that -- that you were not afraid of
12
13
       Brian?
       Α
            Yes.
14
            And, again, as you just testified, these were --
15
16
       these were police officers who you wanted to be on their
       good side. They were paying, you right?
17
18
       Α
            Yes.
            And you had an interest in being honest with them?
19
20
       Α
            Yes.
            And you also said that if some of the young girls
21
22
       were sick because they needed drugs, Brian would give
       them drugs so they would no longer be sick?
23
       Α
            Yeah.
24
25
                 THE COURT: I'm sorry, no longer what?
```

```
MR. KAPLAN: Be sick.
 1
 2
                 THE COURT: Okay.
       BY MR. KAPLAN:
 3
            And is it fair to say that you said all these
 4
       things to the police officers before you prepared your
 5
 6
       testimony for trial that you gave the other day?
 7
            It was a long time ago.
 8
            Way before you sat down with the prosecutors in
       this case and figured out what you were going to say at
 9
       trial?
10
            Yes. It was a long time ago.
11
                 MR. KAPLAN: Could I have a moment, Judge?
12
13
                 THE COURT: Yes.
                 (Brief pause.)
14
                 MR. KAPLAN: I don't have anything further,
15
16
       Judge.
               Thank you.
                 THE COURT: Okay, cross examination?
17
                 MS. SAVNER: Yes, your Honor. May I have one
18
       moment?
19
20
                 THE COURT: Yes.
                 MS. SAVNER: Thank you.
21
22
                 (Brief pause.)
                           CROSS EXAMINATION
23
       BY MS. SAVNER:
24
25
            Hi Chrissy.
```

```
Hi.
       Α
 1
            Sorry you have to be here again.
 2
       Α
            Yes.
 3
            I just want to ask you a few questions about what
 4
       Q
       we heard.
 5
 6
       Α
            Okay.
 7
            So a lot of what you said in there is -- same as
 8
       what you said last week on the stand, right?
 9
       Α
            Yes.
            Okay. So in that interview with Chris May,
10
       Detective May, you said that the girls posted
11
12
       themselves, right?
13
       Α
            Yes.
            And that's what you saw. Sometimes the girls would
14
       post their ads on their own?
15
16
       Α
            Correct.
            And Folks oversaw the ads, right?
       Q
17
18
       Α
            Yes.
            He -- you saw the girls go to him and ask him for
19
20
       his approval --
       Α
            Yes.
21
22
            -- on pictures?
       Α
23
            Yes.
            How many times did you see that?
24
       Q
25
       Α
            A lot.
```

Okay. And that's why Folks paid for their cell 1 Q phones, right? 2 3 Correct. So they could post? 4 Q Α Correct. 5 6 He didn't like to dirty up his own phone, right? 7 Α Right. 8 Q He didn't want criminal stuff on his own phone? Correct. 9 Α And they used the phones that he provided the money 10 for to post Backpage ads, correct? 11 Α Correct. 12 And they used those phones to get the prostitution 13 dates, right? 14 Correct. 15 Α 16 And you said you knew that -- in that interview that V and Ayla were working for him? 17 18 Α Yes. You also testified that Amanda S., Ashley P., Red 19 20 and Jerricka, all these people were working for him? Α Correct. 21 22 And we talked about this last week. If the girls didn't have phones, then they couldn't post, right? 23 Correct. 24 Α 25 Q And Folks knew that?

```
Right.
       Α
 1
            And if they couldn't post, they couldn't make any
 2
 3
       money?
       Α
            Correct.
 4
            You said in that interview with Chris May that
 5
 6
       they -- they paid -- the girls paid Folks for overhead,
 7
       right?
 8
       Α
            Yes.
            So that included hotels? Is that a yes?
 9
       Q
       Α
            Yes. Sorry.
10
            That's okay. Transportation?
11
       Q
12
       Α
            Correct.
            Condoms?
13
       Q
       Α
           Correct.
14
            And the phones?
15
       Q
16
       Α
            Correct.
            They paid him certain amount of their earnings,
       Q
17
18
       right?
            Correct.
19
20
            And with their part of their earnings, they'd buy
       drugs from him, right?
21
22
       Α
            Correct.
            And it was a big no-no to buy drugs from anyone
23
       else, right?
24
25
       Α
            Correct.
```

You said in that interview that there would be 1 Q trouble if they tried to buy drugs from someone else? 2 Correct. 3 And you testified last week about what happened 4 when Red, one of the women who had been prostituting for 5 6 Folks, went over to that rival drug dealer, Black, 7 right? 8 Α Correct. Folks got really upset about that? 9 Α Right. 10 Q He went up to the North Ave. house and got some 11 guns for him and Hightower? 12 13 Α Correct. So you knew that the women who were prostituting 14 for Folks would get in trouble if they bought drugs from 15 16 other people? Α Correct. 17 That was obvious? 18 Α 19 Yes. 20 And all of these girls were severely heroin addicted, right? 21 22 Α Yes. And they were buying their drugs from him with 23 their portion of their earnings? 24 25 Α Correct.

Earnings from prostitution? 1 Α Yes. 2 And you testified last week and you said in this 3 interview that we just heard that sometimes he'd give 4 them a little something to get them well just so they 5 6 could go on the dates, right? 7 Α Correct. 8 But sometimes he even had you do that, right? Correct. 9 Α But then they were expected to come back and pay 10 him with their earnings? 11 Α Correct. 12 13 And buy drugs from him with their earnings? Α Correct. 14 And if they didn't pay him back, there would be 15 16 more trouble, right? Correct. Α 17 Let's talk about Ayla. You said in that interview 18 that Folks actually felt bad because he was the one that 19 20 got her into prostitution in the first place? Α Yes. 21 22 And you said in that interview that you can't believe Ayla. You knew Ayla when she was heavily using 23 heroin, right? 24

25

Α

Correct.

```
And at that time, she was lying and stealing to get
 1
       Q
 2
       by?
            Correct.
       Α
 3
            She stole from you, as you testified about?
 4
       Q
       Α
            Correct.
 5
 6
            And you haven't spent significant time with her in
 7
       the last year or so?
 8
       Α
            No.
            Since you left Lori's house in November before
 9
       2015?
10
       Α
            Correct.
11
            And when you left, she was still there working out
12
       Q
13
       of Lori's, right?
       Α
            Correct.
14
            Prostituting for Folks?
15
       Q
16
       Α
            Correct.
            You said in this audio recording that you weren't
       0
17
18
       scared of him anymore. Did you used to be scared of
       him?
19
20
       Α
            Yes.
            And when you said that, you were in a car with two
21
22
       law enforcement agents, right?
       Α
            Correct.
23
            That you weren't scared of him anymore?
24
       Q
25
       Α
            Yes.
```

Were you, in fact, scared of him, as you testified, 1 on January 12th when he showed up at the Cottage Grove 2 house and you realized he was there? 3 Correct. Α 4 You texted Chris May, "Moe is here. I'm scared. 5 6 OMG," or something like that, right? 7 Α Yes. 8 You told the interviewers in the interview we just heard that you never saw him hit any of the girls. And 9 that's consistent with what you testified last week, 10 right? 11 Α Correct. 12 And you just started working with Moe in mid 2015, 13 right? 14 15 Α Yes. So you didn't see anything that happened with him 16 before that, right? 17 Α No. 18 Okay. And let's talk about what you did see when 19 20 you were at Lori's house working with Moe, because -you don't know what the legal definition of force is, 21 22 right? Or threats of force? 23 No. Okay. So let's talk about what you did see. 24 You 25 did see him being physically intimidating, right?

Α Yes. Most of these women who worked for him were small 2 3 and thin? 4 Α Yes. He towered over them? 5 Q 6 Α Yes. He would step up to them and get in their face? 7 8 Α Yes. You saw him with guns? 9 Q Α Yes. 10 You knew he kept a stash of guns at the North Ave. Q 11 house? 12 13 Α Yes. And you mentioned in that recording we just heard a 14 machine gun too? 15 16 Yes, I believe so. Yes. You saw him put a bounty out for Keisha when she 17 18 stole from you? 19 Α Yes. 20 And you don't know what happened to Keisha after 21 that? 22 Α No. He did things that were humiliating to you, right? 23 Α 24 Yes. 25 And humiliating to the other women? Q

```
Α
            Yes.
 1
            Sometimes he filmed those things?
 2
       Q
 3
       Α
            Yes.
            He kicked girls out when they made him mad?
 4
       Q
       Α
 5
            Yes.
 6
       Q
            Did they have anywhere else to go?
 7
       Α
            No.
 8
       Q
            He took their phones back?
       Α
 9
            Yes.
            And, Chrissy, you said you didn't see him hit any
10
       of the other girls, but he put his hands on you, right?
11
12
       Α
            Yes.
13
            Okay. There was an incident with Folks that you
       have never wanted to talk about, right?
14
            Yes.
15
       Α
16
            And I have asked you about it a few times and you
       have never wanted to say.
17
18
       Α
            Correct.
            Can you tell us now what happened?
19
20
       Α
            No.
21
            Am I correct that he tried to have sex with you?
       Q
22
       Α
            Yes.
            Am I correct that you didn't want him to?
23
       Q
            Can we -- yes. Can we --
24
       Α
25
       Q
            Just --
```

```
Yes. Can we please --
       Α
 1
 2
            Just a few more questions.
            He kept going even though you didn't want him to.
 3
 4
       Α
            Yes.
       Q
            You ended up with bruises?
 5
 6
       Α
            Yes.
            Who was there when this happened?
 7
 8
       Α
            No one.
            Did you tell any of the girls in the house about
 9
       Q
       it?
10
       Α
            No.
11
            So is it possible that he took other girls alone
12
       Q
       and hurt them and you didn't know about it?
13
       Α
            Yes.
14
                 MS. SAVNER: Nothing further.
15
16
                 THE COURT: Okay. Any redirect?
                 MR. KAPLAN: Just a minute, Judge.
17
18
                 (Brief pause.)
                 THE WITNESS: I can't take it anymore.
19
20
       done.
              I'm done. I'm done here.
21
                 MS. SAVNER: Your Honor, can we -- I think the
22
       witness needs a break.
                 THE COURT: Yes. Do you --
23
                 MS. SAVNER: Maybe if we can inquire of
24
25
       Mr. Kaplan is he is going to have anything?
```

MR. KAPLAN: I do have some questions. 1 THE WITNESS: I can't. 2 THE COURT: Okay. Let's -- let's just take a 3 five-minute break. Okay. And the jury can go back in 4 5 the jury room. 6 (Court was in recess at 2:01 p.m.) (The following was held in open court with the jury 7 8 present at 2:11 p.m.) 9 THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Kaplan? REDIRECT EXAMINATION 10 BY MR. KAPLAN: 11 Do you remember on the tape when the police 12 13 officers asked you who was prostituting, you said there were two, Ayla and V? 14 Yes. Among others. 15 16 But you said there were two, Ayla and V, and then you said the others were acting somewhat independently. 17 18 Do you recall that? 19 Α Yes. 20 Okay. And do you recall when you testified last time you gave some context to why you were nervous when 21 22 you saw Brian at Unc's house, because you had stolen drugs from him, right? 23 Yes. 24 Α 25 And he had asked you to leave?

Α Yes. 1 And then you recall saying that you kept e-mailing 2 him or texting him telling him you wanted to come back, 3 that you were sorry? 4 Because I felt wanted or needed. Yes. 5 6 And you weren't so afraid of Brian at that point 7 that -- that you didn't want to come back and work with 8 him? 9 Α Yes. And wasn't that around the same time that you had 10 this conversation with the police, or this -- the 11 conversation a little bit after that? 12 13 I don't recall. But it was after that? 14 I don't recall. 15 Α Q Okay. You don't recall being in the police car --16 I do, but -- yes. 17 MR. KAPLAN: Okay. I have nothing further, 18 your Honor. 19 20 THE COURT: Okay. Anything further from the 21 government? MS. SAVNER: Very briefly, your Honor. 22 THE COURT: Yes. Okay. 23 RECROSS EXAMINATION 24 25 BY MS. SAVNER:

```
Miss Tatro, do you remember giving a written
1
 2
       statement when you signed up to work with Essex?
       Α
            Yes.
 3
            And that was back in November of 2015?
       Q
 4
      Α
           Yes.
 5
 6
            And you said in that statement, "Recently one of
 7
       the guys tried to have sex with me. I said no, and got
 8
       out of there when" --
                 MR. KAPLAN: Objection, your Honor. This goes
 9
      beyond the scope of --
10
                 THE COURT: Isn't that beyond the scope of
11
       cross examination?
12
13
                 MS. SAVNER: It's a prior consistent
       statement. He has just attacked -- it's a prior
14
       consistent statement.
15
                 THE COURT: About a sexual assault?
16
                 MS. SAVNER: Well, I --
17
                 THE COURT: I don't think that was raised in
18
      the cross examination.
19
20
                 MS. SAVNER: The defense counsel --
                 MR. KAPLAN: May we approach, Judge?
21
                                                        If we
       are to discuss this, I think we should --
22
                 THE COURT: Okay. All right.
23
       (The following was held at the bench.)
24
25
                 MR. KAPLAN: I don't know why I asked to
```

```
approach because I didn't know what was going to be said
1
 2
      next, but --
                 THE COURT: What do you want to ask?
 3
                 MR. KAPLAN: I don't want to ask anything. I
 4
      don't want her to ask anything either.
 5
 6
                 THE COURT: Well, okay. So the reason that I
 7
      was about ready to sustain the objection is I didn't
 8
       think that he went in at all into the sexually --
                 MS. SAVNER: Well, he went into the basis for
 9
      her fear.
10
                 MR. KAPLAN: Well, she testified that she
11
      stole drugs.
12
13
                 THE COURT: Well, but there's still an issue
       of timing. I just don't think we want to go down that
14
15
       route again.
                 MS. SAVNER: Okay.
16
                 THE COURT: So you made your point.
17
                 MS. SAVNER: Okay.
18
                 THE COURT: All right.
19
20
       (The following was held in open court.)
                 MS. SAVNER: Chrissy, I don't have any more
21
       questions for you.
                          You can go.
22
                 THE WITNESS: Thank you.
23
                 THE COURT: Okay.
24
                 (Witness excused.)
25
```

THE COURT: Okay. The defense have the next 1 2 witness? MS. SEN: Yes, your Honor. We call Anthony 3 Martino. 4 THE COURT: Okay. 5 ANTHONY MARTINO, 6 having been duly sworn by the courtroom deputy, 7 was examined and testified as follows: 8 THE COURT: Good afternoon. 9 THE WITNESS: Good afternoon, your Honor. 10 DIRECT EXAMINATION 11 BY MS. SEN: 12 13 Could you please state your name and spell it for the record. 14 My name is Anthony, A-N-T-H-O-N-Y, Martino, 15 M-A-R-T-I-N-O. 16 Can you describe your formal educational 17 background, where you went to school. 18 I have a bachelor's degree from the State 19 20 University of New York at Geneseo, and I have a master's degree in economic crime management from Utica College. 21 What did you do after college? 22 After college, I joined the Utica Police Department 23 in the City of Utica, New York. 24 25 And what were your duties during your time in the

Utica Police Department?

A In the early part of my career, I went through a large myriad of typical police duties including routine patrol, et cetera, street-level policing. About four years into my career I became a member of the crime scene unit. I spent nearly four years doing crime scene investigation and evidence collection. I was promoted to the rank of sergeant in my seventh year on the department, and then I became the supervisor of the management information systems unit, which was in charge of all of the IT assets of the department. I was also in charge of the computer crime unit and started and then was the director of the department's computer forensics laboratory.

Q So what kind of training did you receive with respect to digital forensics?

A I have received extensive training in digital forensics. I have received training in basic, intermediate and advanced computer forensics by the National White Collar Crime Center.

I have received training in intermediate forensics from Guidance Software, which is the maker of forensic software called EnCase.

I received training in basic computer forensics as well as two separate courses in advanced computer

forensics for Microsoft Windows systems from Access

Data, Incorporated, which is the maker of another large

forensics software package.

I have received training specifically in the forensic examination of cellular telephones from a company called BK Forensics and also a company called Paraben Forensics, both who make products designed to forensically examine cellular telephones. And I have also been trained by the United States Secret Service both in basic and advanced computer forensics.

- Q Do you have any specialized training in investigating the use of the internet in crimes against children?
- A Yes, I do.

Q Can you describe it a little bit for the jury, please.

A I was actually one of the officers who was part of the initial Internet Crimes Against Children Task Force in Upstate New York. As part of that task force, I received training on multiple occasions from the Internet Crimes Against Children National Task Force specifically in conducting investigations on the internet, investigations primarily aimed at investigating the exploitation of children. And I also received training in conducting undercover operations

| online.

Q Can you just give a brief definition, down to earth, of what digital forensics is?

A Sure.

Digital forensics is the examination of items that contain digital data, traditionally things we think of such as user -- commercial, consumer items: computers, like laptops and desktops, cellular telephones, external media like thumb drives and CDs, but it can also be some nontraditional devices such as gaming systems like Xboxes and PlayStations, hand-held gaming systems, et cetera.

The forensics part of this discipline is applying scientific principles and procedures to the examination of those devices in order to identify and extract information of interest to an investigation.

One of the key tenets of digital forensics is that the -- that process of examining, identifying and extracting happens in a manner that is both forensically sound, meaning that the integrity of that process can be proven, and then it's also conducted in a manner that's repeatable so that another digital forensics examiner should be able to examine the same media, the same device, and arrive at the same conclusions.

Q Approximately how many digital forensic

examinations did you do while you were at the Utica 1 2 Police Department? Hundreds. 3 THE COURT: I'm sorry, I couldn't quite here 4 5 you. 6 BY MS. SEN: Approximately how many digital forensic 7 8 examinations did you conduct while you were at the Utica Police Department? 9 Hundreds. By the time I retired, I was conducting 10 nearly a hundred examinations a year. 11 And during this time you mentioned that you got 12 13 some training from the Secret Service. Did you have any special position? 14 I did. For nine years I was a deputized member of 15 the United States Secret Service Electronic Crime Task 16 Force. 17 And as part of that task force, what did you do? 18 I performed computer crime investigations and 19 20 computer forensic examinations in support of the Secret Service's mission. 21 And in addition, while you were on the police 22 force, did you also begin teaching? 23 I did. 24 Α Could you describe what kind of teaching you did. 25

A Yes.

I've developed and taught courses in cyber security and computer forensics both at the bachelor's and master's degree levels.

- Q And where did you do that?
- A At Utica College in Utica, New York.
  - Q Now, at some point did you retire from the police department?
  - A Yes, I did.
  - Q What did you do next?
  - A When I retired from the police department, I took a full-time position at Utica College. I am still in that position. I am the director of the college's Northeast Cyber Security and Forensic Center. The center at the college is designed to operate a computer forensics laboratory environment that allows for not only the examination of digital evidence but also research and development related to computer forensics in a manner that assists both the academic environment but also private and government sectors as well.
  - Q Do you have a top-level government security clearance?
  - A Yes. I currently hold a top secret government clearance.
- 25 | Q And is that connected to your work in digital

forensics? 1 That's actually connected to -- in addition to 2 working at the Northeast Cyber Security and Forensics 3 Center, I am a founder and current partner in a private 4 cyber security firm, and our firm has government 5 6 contracts specifically with the United States Air Force, so that clearance is related to that work. 7 8 Have you ever testified in a case before? Yes, I have. Α 9 How many times have you been qualified as an expert 10 in digital forensics? 11 I would say at least a half a dozen, maybe a few 12 13 more. And have you testified in both federal and state 14 court? 15 Yes, I have. 16 And have you been qualified as an expert in the 17 federal court? 18 Yes, I have. 19 20 MS. SEN: Your Honor, I would offer Mr. Martino as an expert qualified in the area of digital 21 forensics, both computers and cell phones. 22 THE COURT: Okay. Anyone --23 MR. GRADY: No objection, your Honor. 24 THE COURT: Okay. So qualified. 25

BY MS. SEN:

Q Could you please walk the jury through what happens from the time that a computer is seized until it's examined?

A So as I testified, one of the key tenets of computer forensics is to ensure the integrity of the examination process, and that truly begins prior to its arrival in a laboratory environment.

Like any evidence, digital evidence has the opportunity to become damaged, corrupted, et cetera. So it's actually very fragile, although the devices themselves are not. The evidence contained within them can be extremely fragile. So from the time that a device is seized, the expectation is that, number one, that device be protected in a manner which will ensure that the data on that device remains in its state.

So as a couple examples of external influences, computers and water don't get along. So certainly we would expect that when a device is seized, whether it be a cell phone or a computer, et cetera, it be kept clean, dry.

A number of different media that data can be stored on, including our traditional hard drives, are magnetic, so there are actually steps that have to be taken to ensure that those media stay away from strong magnetic

fields, because it could actually destroy the data.

The key component of preserving digital evidence up -- from seizure until examination is really the same as physical evidence, is that there's a solid chain of custody that can describe the exact movements and handling of a piece of evidence at every moment and at every transfer or transition of it and steps in place to ensure that the data on those devices, when they are seized, remains intact, uncorrupted and unaltered until the device can be examined.

Q So when you receive a piece of digital -- a digital device to examine, what are some of the first things that you look for?

A One of the first things we look for is to ensure that the device is intact and in the same manner that it was seized. Small devices commonly that are submitted to our laboratory via law enforcement agencies come in evidence bags. So they're sealed bags. Seals are initialed by seizing officers. So when we receive evidence in that manner, we expect it to be sealed and initialed properly. If those seals are broken for any reason, we would make note of that in our report.

Larger items that don't regularly fit into an evidence bag, like a computer tower or gaming systems, et cetera, we expect to at least be properly labeled so

that we can identify the device.

It's also common in some law enforcement agencies with the larger devices that they will seal certain portions of the device with evidence tape since the entire device won't fit in a normal evidence bag. So it is common that we will receive, for instance, a computer tower with evidence tape over the power, where the power plug would plug in, and over -- sometimes over the power button, and that evidence tape would be initialed so that when those security mechanisms are in place, one of the first things we do is check that they are intact and there's no sign of damage or tampering to the device before we received it.

Q So if you determined that a computer has been powered on after it was seized by law enforcement before you receive it, what do you do?

A If that's determined during an investigation, we will stop our forensic examination at that point.

Notifications would be made to the case agent or the case agency that submitted that piece of evidence. This tends to be a bigger issue in criminal cases. It's a little more uncommon in private cases that don't involve litigation.

In a criminal case, we would also notify the prosecutor or the defense, depending on who submitted it

to our laboratory, because we do do work for both prosecution and defense, and then wait for direction on whether or not our examination should continue.

We will, though, make notice to whoever submitted the evidence that at that point we can only attest to the integrity of the data that's present on any -- on that particular device from the time it came into our possession, and we cannot make statements or testify about it prior to that point.

- Q Why not? What are the implications of a device being powered on before you receive it?
- A The implication, as with pretty much any computer device, modern computer device, powering on that device necessarily causes changes to the memory of that device. So in the case of a computer, it necessarily causes irreversible changes to the hard drive; in the case of a cellular telephone, irreversible changes to the memory present in the cell phone. And we cannot forensically undo those changes. So we cannot testify in any way as to the state of that device prior to us receiving it.

With computers, in particular, the challenge is in the way that computers save data and then -- and then delete data. There's been testimony in this case about unallocated space, which is the area of -- on the computer, for instance, the area of the hard drive where

files that have been deleted reside.

The example I have used before is think of it as an apartment building. If one of the tenants in one apartment is moving out, you are going to put that apartment up for rent, and you may allow that tenant to stay until the new tenant arrives. But before that, you put a "for rent" sign on the door so everyone knows that apartment is available. It's kind of how computers save data.

When either a user or the system deletes a file, which both happen regularly, the area that file occupies on the hard drive has marked it as available for rent, essentially. That data does not immediately disappear from the hard drive. The user may no longer be able to see it, but it's still there. And one of the key functions and capabilities of computer forensics is the ability to read and analyze that data. It is often, in many cases, critically important to understand the files that the person operating the device deleted but also to be able to examine the files that the device itself deleted.

So in your question, if a computer is powered on and changes are being made, the system will, all on its own, create new files as part of its process of powering on that computer. Those -- and it will also modify

files as that process.

All of that has to go somewhere, and the place it goes, in the case of a computer, is the unallocated space. And it is now taking over space that was previously occupied by other data. From a forensic standpoint, we can't peel those layers back and tell you what used to be there. We can just tell you what's there now.

So one of the key pillars of forensic integrity of computers or any electronic device is that we don't want that device powered on, and from a forensic standpoint, we want to be able to control the access to data on that computer or that device at all times.

- Q So once you have a computer and you begin examining it, what exactly do you do?
- A So the examination of a computer would begin with the removal of the hard drive from the computer where possible. A lot of modern computers don't have traditional hard drives, so there are other steps for those, but where possible, the hard drive is removed.

The hard drive is then connected to a device called a forensic write blocker. That device is like a one-way valve. It allows data to be read but does not allow data to be written, deleted or in any other way changed in any form.

Once the hard drive is connected to that device, a complete what we call bit copy is made, otherwise known as a forensic image. And what that means is the data stored on a hard drive -- a thumb drive, a CD, or any other electronic media -- is really just ones and zeros. At its heart, all computing devices are binary. They can only work in ones and zeros. So that forensic image of that hard drive or that bit copy is a copy of every single one and zero from the evidence in its exact position, in its exact state, all the way from the very beginning to the very end with no alteration whatsoever.

That is step one, is to create that forensic image, because all further examination will happen on that forensic image, not on the original device.

- Q Is there a particular way of documenting what you are examining as you are doing it?
- A There's -- there's several ways of examine -- of documenting items of interest or items of evidence during a forensic examination. One of the most -- most of the common forensic software packages provide mechanisms for either tagging or bookmarking items of interest and then later a mechanism for combining all of those tags or all of those bookmarks into an outputtable report.

Certainly many times there are handwritten notes

that go along with that process and then eventually get compiled into a final report of findings.

- Q Is there a difference between conducting a forensic examination of a cell phone and a forensic examination of a computer?
- A Yes. They're actually dramatically different.
- Q Can you just briefly sort of describe what the differences are?
- A Although as users we think of cell phones as just little tiny computers because we can do the same things -- we can browse the internet, we can send and receive an e-mail, it feels a lot like the computer feels -- they do not operate the same way at their core.

The way they store data is different. The format the data's stored in is radically different, and the way we can examine them is different. So back to my testimony a few minutes ago:

On the computer, we talked about removing the hard drive and write protecting that hard drive so you could read data from it and would be prevented from moving any data into it. With cell phones, we don't have that capability. There is no removable hard drive in a cell phone. Memory in a cell phone is stored on chips that are soldered to circuit boards. Removing those are — is extremely difficult, takes very specialized tools,

very specialized training, and presents great risks to the integrity of the data.

So the tools we use to examine cell phones have to interact with the cell phone directly. Rather than the -- the storage being removed from the device, we interact with the phones in their native environment. Right off the bat, that requires the phone to be powered on.

So in the computer world, where at all costs we expect not to have the evidence powered on, in the cell phone forensics world, traditionally it's -- it's an expectation and a realization that that phone will need to be powered on. It's also an expectation and a realization that changes will be made to that phone during that process. It's -- we can't avoid that. It's unavoidable. And it's also an expectation that we will -- we will insert data into that cellular phone as part of the forensic process.

Whereas in computers, we simply read data out almost as if we're listening to something without ever speaking, with cell phones we actually have to make requests. So by way of forensic software and hardware, we actually send requests into the cell phone and then wait for responses to come back.

So the examination of those two devices are -- is

very different. The mechanisms of ensuring integrity is very different, and the acceptance of certain risks to the changing of data is different.

- Q Do you ever need to take a cell phone apart in order to examine it?
- A Yes. There are extreme examples of cases where a device needs to be -- a cellular device needs to be disassembled in order to read the data from it.
- Q You are aware that Mr. Thornton testified about tearing apart a cell phone here because he couldn't examine it. Do you think that that was, in your opinion, based on your experience -- was that something that was necessary?
- A No. From listening to Mr. Thornton's testimony, I don't agree with that path of action. Mr. Thornton testified that he was able to power the phone on and see items that he felt were of evidentiary importance to his investigation. He was able to use a camera to capture images of those items.

He was asked the question of whether or not there was additional items on the phone other than what was captured, and his answer was that he was able to capture everything that was -- all the user content that was on the phone, which then indicates to me that there's no reason to -- to disassemble the phone.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The disassembly of the phone, as I mentioned, requires very significant training and equipment, and even with the best training and equipment environments, laboratory environments, still creates a significant risk of the destruction of data. So in your experience with -- doing online investigations and internet crime investigations, how have you -- well, maybe you could describe for the jury, do you use IP addresses in the course of those investigations? Α Yes. And maybe you can describe briefly how you use them. Yeah, I think we probably first have to describe what an IP address is because I don't think there's been testimony -- at least to my knowledge there has not been testimony in this case. Sure. So if you could briefly describe what an IP address is? So the term "IP address" is short for -- IP is an acronym for internet protocol. An IP address is the way that devices on the internet or any network find each other. Every -- simplified, every single device that

talks on the internet has to have an IP address. And

every device in the whole world can only possess --

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

any -- any one IP address can only be possessed by one device at any given time. That's a little simplified, but -- and there are some exceptions and exclusions, ways that multiple devices can hide behind one address, but in a simplified manner, every device needs one IP address.

So how do you find an IP address?

So IP addresses are not unique to a specific They generally come from the provider that is providing internet access to that device. So in the example of a cellular telephone, if you have a Verizon account, Verizon actually provides your cellular telephone with an IP address. And that IP address does not stay with your phone for any great length of time.

It stays with your phone for the short period of time that your phone needs to talk on the internet while you are actively browsing. When you stop actively browsing, that IP address will be returned to the Verizon system, and it will be assigned to another user by Verizon.

So is it -- is it possible to figure out what IP address was being used to access the internet at a particular point in time?

Yes. So as -- there's been multiple exhibits admitted so far in this case that include responses from

internet service providers such as social media like
Facebook and websites such as Backpage. And many of
those exhibits have included IP address information,
because this is the way that devices on the internet
identify each other. And this is the way that service
providers, like Facebook or Backpage, keep track of the
devices that access their systems.

So in a typical investigation involving internet crime or any other investigation on the internet, the investigation usually begins at the end. So, for instance, if there is a question of who posted something to a particular place on the internet -- maybe a specific post to Facebook -- the investigation will usually begin at Facebook and say, well, there's an account name but that account name is not necessarily uniquely identifying of a human -- one particular human being, and so the question to Facebook, which is usually in the form of a court order, is what device connected to this account on a specific date at a specific time when that posting or that change or that update was made.

And then the response back from that service provider will typically be an IP address. That IP address then has to be traced to the owner, which is public record.

Q How do you do that?

A You can look it up on the internet. It's actually called a WHOIS search. So you would actually query a WHOIS database and say who is the IP address?

- Q And what information would you get back from that query?
- A You'd get back the owner. So like I mentioned, most individuals don't own an IP address. They're using one that their service provider -- their internet service provider is providing for them, so most likely what you would get back is Verizon Wireless, Charter Communications, Comcast Cable, et cetera, et cetera. So you get back the owner of the IP address.
- Q And then what do you do?
- A Then you send a court order to that owner. So, for instance, you send a subpoena to Verizon Wireless and you say on this date at this time when this certain event of interest happened, which one of your customers possessed this IP address? And then the response back will be all -- and then, of course, you ask for the subscriber information as well.

So what you would get back or what you expect to get back from a company like Verizon, or the others, would be specific customer information: a name, an address, bill information, potentially e-mail address,

potentially phone numbers, et cetera, of the specific customer who has the service that was used.

Q Earlier today Ms. Epp had testified about how -- I had asked her about how she didn't trace IP addresses in this case, and there was some discussion and testimony about how, given the fact that what they were investigating is prostitution and it was being conducted in hotels and people were transient, that using IP addresses is not very helpful. And could you provide an opinion about that based on your experience in investigations?

A Well, from Ms. Epp's testimony, that appeared to be an assumption, not a state of fact based on investigation. She is correct in so much that a place like a hotel that provides guest wireless access -- many hotels do not, but many.

Another good example might be a public library.

Those places would become a data end of the investigation because it might show that the Hilton Hotel in Burlington, Vermont, is the -- was the user of that particular IP address on that stated date and time, and most public access, like hotels, restaurants, et cetera, have no mechanism of getting you any further, of being able to tell you which one of their customers was using that IP on that date and time.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The issue in this case in particular is that from all of the material I have reviewed, I didn't see any attempt to try to check those IP addresses, and some of the work that I did as part of this case was to at least WHOIS a sampling of the IP addresses that were found within some of the materials and the exhibits, and I actually found that the majority that I checked came back to cellular telephone companies, particularly Sprint and T-Mobile. And cellular telephone companies are usually pretty good about keeping track of who their customers are and so provide a mechanism -- pretty clear mechanism for tracking an IP address down to a specific customer who was using it on a specific date at a specific time. So we talked about the fact, and you are obviously aware of the fact, that Mr. Thornton examined the hard drive in this HP computer? Α Yes, I am. And you are aware that the computer was powered on before he received it by Miss Epp? Yes, I am. Α And what does his failure to indicate that computer was powered on indicate about his reporting and examination of the computer, in your opinion?

I would certainly have expected his reports to

identify the fact that the computer had been powered on prior to his examination. It is a key point in identifying the integrity of the data that was examined.

I was present for Mr. Thornton's testimony, and he testified that he knew it had been powered on but didn't find that relevant. I personally -- my opinion is I disagree with that. I think it's highly relevant and should have been documented and brought to the attention of the case agents and the prosecutor.

Q Mr. Thornton also submitted a number of reports based on his examination. In your opinion, do those reports meet industry accepted standards of digital forensic reports?

A No, they do not.

Q And why not?

A The reports Mr. Thornton have -- has as exhibits in this case are missing several components that are expected as an industry accepted standard. A forensic report should have a description of the case itself. It should have a description of the tasks that were assigned to the forensic examiner. For the reader of the report to be able to discern whether or not the forensic examiner found all the evidence he or she was supposed to be looking for, they have to know what they were looking for first.

On its face, Mr. Thornton's report doesn't explain what his assigned task was. So it's impossible to determine if his reports are complete or if his examination was complete.

There's also an expectation that the forensic examiner will create a conclusion of findings. What -- so based on the tasks assigned, based on the actions taken, based on the evidence found, what's the conclusion? And Mr. Thornton's reports do not contain that.

- Q And you are aware that Mr. Thornton used a tool to examine the hard drive called the Forensic Explorer?

  A Yes, I am.
- Q What does using that tool -- does that have any implications for the results of his examination of a hard drive?

A The Forensic Explorer tool is not considered a comprehensive forensic tool in this industry. It is forensically sound, and it is one -- most forensic examiners and most forensic laboratories have an entire suite of tools that they use at their disposal. Not every tool is good at every task. It's much like having tools in a literal physical tool box. One screwdriver won't fix everything. You need different sized screwdrivers, different sized wrenches, for example.

And forensics is the same.

Certainly that tool has uses. It is not generally considered to be highly comprehensive. There are components of forensic examination that -- that it is not capable of performing.

Q So what impact did using that tool have on this examination of the computer in this case?

A I think the biggest impact was that his examination appeared to be limited to essentially cursory searches of the hard drive rather than an in-depth analysis of the computer itself: the system, the data stored by the system, how the system operated, when certain events took place. It appeared as though his -- his analysis would -- was much more high level.

Q And one of the things that it appears that
Mr. Thornton did is he used screenshots from the
Forensic Explorer tool in order to create -- to document
what he was looking at on the computer. Is that an
appropriate way to document what you find on a computer?
A There are times where screenshots are used to
document evidence. They are more the exclusion than

document evidence. They are more the exclusion than rule. It is -- they're usually used in circumstances where the evidence cannot be forensically displayed in a humanly acceptable manner. There's a lot of data in a computer that is not meant for human consumption and

does not look like what we as humans need to understand the impact of that information.

So there are circumstances where the only and best way of documenting evidence is through a screen capture of a user interface where that data has been interpreted. But like I mentioned, that is more the exception than the rule. As a rule, we prefer to use the forensic tool reporting mechanisms that are built into the tools.

Part of the concern with screen captures is that they are digital pictures, and then as someone who has to sit here and testify about the integrity of evidence, you have to worry about answering the question, well, isn't it possible that picture was manipulated, edited, altered, even to the extent that if the picture is not the same -- if the screenshot is not the same resolution as the picture itself that might be being displayed, could that lend itself to a different interpretation of the evidence?

So our preference is to use the tools built into our forensic software to create reports. When we do that, those reports also come out with an extensive amount of information about the evidence that's being presented.

You know, in particular, during testimony earlier

today, Miss Epp couldn't testify to the time that a certain image was created on the computer because that exhibit lacked any headings above the dates and times. So there was no way for her to understand what the dates and times meant. That shouldn't happen, right? And using the tools in forensic software to create reports ensures that all of the information relevant to a particular file that's -- that's of evidentiary value is also reported on.

- Q So Mr. Thornton identified a number of photographs that were found on the hard drive. Aside from identifying those photographs, though, is there any indication in any of his reports about how those pictures arrived on the computer?
- A No, there is not.

- Q And can you please explain to the jury what the various ways are that a picture could arrive on a computer?
- A There's long list of reasons why a particular picture or any file, for that matter, is present on the computer.

The most obvious, of course, is that the picture is downloaded from a website, which is probably one of the more common ways that pictures end up on computers. It could also be transferred from external media such as a

thumb drive or an external hard drive or a CD or a DVD. The picture could also be there because it was transferred from a cloud location.

For instance, commonly Apple devices like iPhones -- many users of iPhones also use Apple's cloud service, which is called iCloud. One of the nice things about iCloud is it synchronizes the pictures you take with your phone to your computer for you so that they're on -- they're present on the computer. There's -- a phone or a digital camera could be connected directly to the computer and images could be transferred.

So there's really a long list of different ways that a picture could come to be saved on a computer.

Q And is one of those ways also being sent to the user of the computer within an attachment, through a message as an attachment?

A Sure.

A user could receive a picture as an attachment to an e-mail, as an attachment to an instant messenger makes, and then choose to -- to save it to the computer.

- Q And what kinds of information can you learn about pictures that may be found on the hard drive?
- A There's three main sources of information about a picture that's located on a hard drive. The first source is the picture itself. Beyond the content, that

visual -- visual content that we can see, many but not all digital images can contain what we call metadata, which is information stored inside the picture that is not part of the visual representation of the picture.

Metadata is placed into the picture by the device that takes the picture. Which portions of metadata are present in that picture is dependent on the device that takes that picture. With few exceptions, that metadata will not be changed within that picture, no matter -- even if the picture is transmitted, if it's received, if it's copied and pasted, if it's resized, printed, metadata will largely remain the same with a few exceptions.

So that's the first place where we could find information about the picture. That metadata information typically will tell us the make and model of the device that took the picture, the date the picture was taken, and sometimes will tell us some information about the camera settings of the device, dependent on the device.

The second place where we find information about a picture that's saved on a computer is in the file system information. And this has been previously testified to as MAC times, MAC being an acronym for modified, accessed and created. The file system of the computer

tracks when a file is created, when a file is modified, and when a file is accessed, bearing in mind, though, that that is unique to the device that the file is sitting on. So when a particular computer marks a file as created on a certain date, that means it's saved to this device on that date. Doesn't mean it's the date the picture was taken. That comes on the metadata. So the date created means on this device.

File system data, the MAC times, are influenced by the movement of files, and they are influenced by the changing of files. If a picture were altered, resized, copied, pasted, printed, those settings can be changed. And those settings are readily visible to the user.

The third place that information about a picture on a computer can be found is from the computer itself.

Whenever files are saved to a computer, sent from a computer to another location, copied, pasted, edited, altered, opened, viewed, played, there are certain artifacts created on that computer about that occurrence and about that activity. They're not there forever, and they are not -- not every single event that happens related to a file is recorded and kept in a manner that can be found later.

But to a great extent, to your question, one of the key places to find out information about a picture on a

computer would be from the computer itself to try to 1 2 find artifacts that indicate how that picture got here, possibly where it came from, and potentially what's been 3 done with it while it was here, how many times it was 4 opened, saved, edited, et cetera. 5 THE COURT: All right. It is three o'clock. 6 7 This is a good time for our break. So let's take a 8 15-minute break and be back a little after quarter after three. 9 (Court was in recess at 3:04 p.m.) 10 (The following was held in open court with the jury 11 present at 3:25 p.m.) 12 13 THE COURT: Okay. Miss Sen? MS. SEN: Thank you, your Honor. 14 15 CONTINUED DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MS. SEN: 16 So before our break, you were describing to the 17 jury the kinds of information that you can learn from a 18 picture once it's arrived on a computer, right? 19 20 Α Yes. So I wanted to show you some of the photos that 21 came in as exhibits during Miss Epp's testimony 22 yesterday. I am going to show you a -- the Exhibit 51B, 23 which is photos of Katelynn C. 24 25 And actually, in order to assist you, I'm going to

hand you what's been marked as Defendant's Exhibit ZZ8.

Can you describe what that is, Mr. Martino?

A Yes.

Defendant's ZZ8 is printout of a spreadsheet that I created. The spreadsheet has one, two -- approximately nine rows. This was created as a summary of the file system export that I received from the government. The export we requested from the government was all of the file system information for all of the files on the HP computer, so inclusive of things like the file name, the path to the location on the hard drive where the file was stored, the date the file was modified, created, accessed, et cetera.

That spreadsheet, as expected, is quite lengthy.

It's approximately 400,000 rows long, so it was impractical to print out and bring to court. So I took certain entries from that spreadsheet that were of relevance to my testimony and put them on a single spreadsheet that could be printed out in two pages.

Those two pages are what are Defendant's ZZ8.

- Q And just to be clear, this is just information -- descriptive information about files that exist on the hard drive?
- A That's correct. It's descriptive information from the file system. It is not the files themselves.

Q So I am going to show you what was marked as -- or admitted yesterday as Government's Exhibit 51B. And I am going to show you this photo on the -- on the lower right, which has the name SMH 012.

So this exhibit indicates that the photo was taken -- well, can you describe what information you have here about this photo.

A So the information provided in this exhibit relative to the photo SMH 012 includes the name of the file which is present in the left-most column; the date modified, which is expected to be the date modified from the MAC times of the computer; the type of file, which for this particular file is a JPEG image; the size of the file.

There's information titled "date acquired." I don't know what that information is based on the terminology used here.

Q Is that a term that is used within digital forensics to refer to anything that you are aware of?

A It would normally be a term used to describe the imaging process, when a device is acquired or imaged, but that isn't relevant to this exhibit, so I am not clear -- during Ms. Epp's testimony, she testified as to what she believed that date was, but it did not, to me, make sense.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And then last column all the way to the right is the date taken. This is presumed to be metadata from the image. JPEG images, as this one is, are capable of storing metadata, and so the expectation -- it's not possible to get the date taken from the file system, so the expectation is that that column contains information that was extracted from the metadata off this picture. Q And what does it show that the date taken was? The date taken for this picture is 9/17/2013. Α Have you been able to learn from the file system data that you have referenced that's in front of you when that photo actually arrived on the computer? Yes. This exhibit did not contain a create date, so it was not possible to determine from the exhibit. So using the file system export provided by the government, I was able to show that the picture SMH 012 was saved to the computer or created on 7/22/14. And that's based on information from the hard drive itself that you were able to find? Α That's correct. What's the significance of the fact that the photo was taken on September 17th of 2013, but wasn't created on the computer until July 22nd, 2014, almost a year later? I think your question is, is the significance is

just the point in understanding the amount of time that 1 elapsed between the time that the picture was actually 2 taken and the time that it was saved to this computer. 3 I'm going to show you another exhibit that was 4 admitted yesterday. So the bottom image -- this was a 5 6 Backpage ad. It's Government's Exhibit 50D. And Ms. Epp, during her testimony, referenced the fact that the 7 8 bottom photo here from this ad was found on the hard drive. Do you remember that? 9 I do. 10 So now I am going to refer you to Government's 11 Exhibit 50B, which are apparently photos from the hard 12 drive. There's a photo there on the left. Is that 13 similar to the photo in the Backpage ad that we just 14 looked at? 15 The photo here with the label "My Cars 3508" 16 is visually similar to the photo from the Backpage ad. 17 So -- I'm sorry. I need to go back to the Backpage 18 ad for a second. 19 20 Do you remember what date the Backpage ad was 21 posted? It was January 2nd -- I'm going to need to 22 reference it again. 23 24 Q Sure. Α 25 I don't want to do it from memory.

So the posted date is actually present in the ad at 1 the top. Posted January 2nd, 2016. 2 So as we were discussing, Miss Epp had testified 3 that they found the same photo in this hard drive, this 4 photo My Cars 3508. Do you have any information when 5 6 that photo was actually created in the hard drive? 7 The photo My Cars 3508 was saved to the Α Yes. 8 computer and created on 2/1/2016. And what's the significance of that? 9 The significance is that the Backpage ad was 10 created nearly a month prior to the presence of this 11 image on the computer. So this computer logically would 12 not have been part of or used in the creation of that 13 Backpage ad. 14 Now I am going to show you again the same Backpage 15 ad, 50D, but it has a second page. I am going to ask 16 you to look at the photo at the bottom. And Miss Epp 17 had testified that this image also was found on the hard 18 drive? 19 20 Α Yes. So I'm going to turn back to the extract of 21 pictures from the hard drive. I'm going to ask you to 22 look at the top right photo called "My Cars 3507." 23 that similar to the same picture in the Backpage ad? 24

Yes, it is visually similar to the picture in the

25

Backpage ad. 1 And when was that photo created on the computer? 2 Q That photo was created on the computer on 2/1/2016. 3 And we'd already talked about the fact that this 4 was part of a Backpage ad that was actually posted on 5 January 2nd of 2016. 6 That's correct. 7 Α 8 So it arrived on the computer a month later? Yes, it did. Α 9 So we'd also talked about earlier these two 10 pictures that were found on the hard drive, image 3027 11 and KK 137. Can you tell us anything about when 12 13 these -- what -- so -- sorry. Earlier today Miss Epp had testified that these are 14 nearly identical photos, and she testified -- we talked 15 about how the date taken for these photos differs. 16 Yes, that's correct. 17 And she provided some testimony about how that's 18 possible because, based on her training and experience, 19 20 it's the last -- the photo was taken at least on the latest date, and it couldn't have been any earlier than 21 that. 22 23

Based on your forensic analysis, what is the significance of having the same picture with two different dates for which it was taken?

24

25

A I personally -- my opinion is I disagree with Miss Epp's testimony. The date taken is designed -- as part of metadata, it's designed to permanently reflect the date that that device took that picture. It does not change when the photo is altered, with the exclusion of if the photo was, for example, sent through a social media, many times social media providers will scrub the metadata out of it entirely, in which case it would be totally absent.

I agree with Miss Epp's visual look and belief that one of these pictures is brighter than the other; and why, I don't know. Forensically we can't tell you why. But that -- for instance, if someone were to have altered this photo in order to brighten it, or change the contrast or any other editing that would affect the photo, the visual parts of the photo, the date taken, would not be changed because that picture has not been taken again.

The date -- metadata is inserted by the device that takes the picture. Changing the contrast, the brightness, et cetera, is not taking the picture.

My concern with this picture is that the two pictures are obviously identical. I don't believe that it would be possible to bring a human being to a location and pose them in such a perfectly identical

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

manner with the same background, even with the same hair in the same spots, on two different dates that are months apart from each other; it seems impossible. from a forensic standpoint, I question the -- the data. I question that the data is accurate and correct and don't -- this tells me I can't rely on that information. Something has corrupted that information. Because the date taken of the image would never change given the way you described metadata; isn't that correct? Unless it's intentionally changed. The date taken does not change. Metadata -- the whole reason metadata exists is to prevent what Miss Epp testified to from happening. The idea was -- of creating metadata was that this information about the photo would travel with it, in theory, forever. So you would always be able to know the date it was actually taken. You would always be able to know the camera that took it and possibly even the settings of the camera for certain devices. The whole tenet of metadata is that it's static. And we also looked at earlier today with Miss Epp this ad, 48D, which is a Backpage ad. So when was this ad created?

A Well, there's -- there's two dates here related to this ad. So the ad itself is in the top portion of this

exhibit, above that. That is the advertisement itself.

Below that is what's called administrative data.

So the administrative data is neither created nor -- most of it is -- nor is it viewable to the user. This was what was kept by Backpage. So this administrative data at the bottom was provided when the government either subpoenaed or sent a search warrant to Facebook. So the ad itself states that the ad was posted October 22nd, 2015. However, the administration -- administrative data states that the ad was created on June 10th, 2015.

- Q And then there's also some other data on the right-hand side that -- the "user created" and the "e-mail verified"?
- A Yes. Well, that's unique to the user. So certainly a user -- the expectation, of course, and it makes sense, the user was created before the ad was created, before the ad was posted. The e-mail gets verified later than all of this, which basically just means that Backpage didn't send a verification to whatever e-mail was on record for this account at the time this was created. Backpage didn't send one of those, you know, "click here in the e-mail so we know you're really you." So that didn't happen until the following year in 2016.

So what does it mean that the ad was created on 0 Wednesday, June 10th, and it was posted on October 22nd? It -- we don't know for certain because there's not enough information here, but the likely cause is that either the ad was created in draft and not posted to the internet until many months later, or the ad was edited over time and reposted, essentially. So the content was changed over time, and what we're looking at at the top may be the final iteration of it rather than what it was when it began. But there is not enough information to know for certain which of those scenarios is true. I'm going to show you, after I clear this, what the second page of this ad -- where there's some photos that we also discussed earlier today. And there are three images present. Did you look

for the third image on the hard drive?

I did. Α

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

19

20

21

22

23

24

- What did you find? 18
  - I found the third image, the one all the way to the right, is present on the HP hard drive.
  - And did you -- were you able to find out when that photo was actually created on the computer?
  - Yes, I was. Α
  - And what did you learn? Q
- Α 25 That image was created on the computer on

3/10/2016.

- Q So that's almost six months after the ad was posted?
- A That is correct.
- Q So Mr. Thornton talked about a number of websites that he had accessed -- that he had identified were accessed through the computer, and he had developed this Exhibit 75 that was admitted yesterday. And you were here in the courtroom when Mr. Thornton was testifying. Is there some information missing from this exhibit?

  A There is.

So Mr. Thornton testified, and the title of the exhibit correctly indicates, that this exhibit is the history from the Google Chrome internet browser from the HP computer, and Mr. Thornton testified the title does indicate that it is, as it states, "select sites."

My concern with this exhibit is it doesn't give a full picture of the internet browsing history that was occurring on the computer.

- Q Did you have an opportunity to do some investigation into that?
- A Yes. So as part of my investigation, we requested the complete output, complete export of all of the internet history from the computer, keeping in mind that computers don't keep internet history forever. It's

kept for a finite period of time. That amount of time is set -- can be altered by the user. Also keeping in mind that the internet history file is not the sole location on a computer where evidence or artifacts of internet activity can be found.

However, we did request and were given by the government a complete export of the internet history for the computer.

Q And what did you find?

A So some of the findings are very similar to Mr. Thornton's findings. Mr. Thornton did find and correctly identify that there are visits to the backpage.com website, and some of those are visible here. There's -- there's actually numerous in this exhibit.

Looking at the complete Chrome history actually shows quite a few more visits to the backpage.com website. What's interesting in the rest of the history is the nature of the visits.

Mr. Thornton testified yesterday that to an extent, just from this limited amount of information, you can get an idea of where in a certain website a user is and what content they're viewing. So the URL in the center column shows us the actual website address, and the title shows us, you know, presumably the title of the

material being viewed.

So one of the things found when you look at the entirely available internet history is that a large number of visits to the backpage.com website are to the downloads page. You would see a URL very similar, for instance, for instance, to this one except instead of "/payment" you see "/download" and then a file name. And there were a very large quantity of those.

- Q And based on your examination, what can you infer from that?
- A The inference is that the user of the computer is downloading individual pictures from the backpage.com website to the hard drive of the computer.
- Q And would you be able to identify if there are photos that are uploaded to Backpage?
- A There are artifacts that can be present on the computer when files are uploaded to -- to a particular website. Yes.
- Q And were you able to find any of those? Or did you have the tools to find those on this -- when you did this examination?
- A No. The examination that I performed was limited both in scope, time and also by the tools that were available. It was really what we would call a forensic preview, not a forensic examination. But in the limited

amount of data that we were given from the government, 1 or able to access on our own, I did not see any 2 indication of uploads to the backpage.com website. 3 MS. SEN: Your Honor, may I have just a 4 moment, please? 5 6 THE COURT: Yes. 7 (Brief pause.) 8 MS. SEN: Your Honor, we don't have anything further at this time. 9 THE COURT: Okay. Any cross examination? 10 MR. GRADY: Yes, your Honor. 11 CROSS EXAMINATION 12 13 BY MR. GRADY: Mr. Martino, you covered lots of -- give me a 14 minute to get organized. 15 Yes, sir. 16 MR. GRADY: And if we could switch from the 17 ELMO, Joanne, to the government counsel. Thank you. 18 BY MR. GRADY: 19 20 Mr. Martino, I first want to show you 47B. Now, you talked earlier in your testimony today about the 21 impact that powering on the computer had on February 22 2nd, 2017. Right? 23 24 Α Yes. 25 Now, would you agree that powering on the computer Q

did not have an impact on photos shown in 47B? 1 The analysis that I did showed that these did 2 Α not appear to be affected. 3 If they were affected, the date modified, the date 4 created, the date accessed would be 2/2/17 or later? 5 Yes. 6 7 And we can be certain that the photo was taken on 8 May 17th, 2013? To the extent that we trust the data in the 9 exhibit. 10 Yes, sir. And let's go to the next page. 11 Same thing as it relates to the file name Han5; 12 13 there's no indication that powering on the computer impacted the data that's contained in 47B-002? 14 That's correct. 15 And by the way, who -- does the user have to rename 16 the file Han5 or My Cars 2415 or My Cars 2416? 17 Most likely. Or it was named that. It went up to 18 the location it came from, and when it got copied, 19 20 downloaded, et cetera, it came with that name, one or the other. That is not typical nomenclature for a 21 camera or a phone. 22 23 Sure. Would you agree, Mr. Martino, that the files that 24 were created on February 2nd, 2017, are system operating 25

files? 1 They are predominately system files, but not 2 exclusively. 3 But consistent with what you would expect to see 4 when one powers on a computer? 5 It's consistent with both powering on and a level 6 7 of user activity. 8 You're not disagreeing -- well, let me ask it this There's no indication that the government inserted 9 any files such as the files in 47B onto the hard drive? 10 No, there is not. 11 Α Because if that was the case, you would see a 12 0 13 create date of 2/2/17 or later? It depends if the person doing it knew what they 14 were doing or not. There are certainly mechanisms to do 15 so without causing that to happen, but there's -- there 16 was no evidence in what I could see that that occurred. 17 Now, I want to talk a little bit about the websites 18 that you -- we talked about in Exhibit 75. And I 19 20 believe your testimony is that the information that you saw was consistent with someone searching on Backpage. 21 Correct? 22 It was actually that I saw multiple indications of 23 someone downloading files from Backpage. 24

And to download, you have to go to Backpage to view

25

```
different ads in order to download files or download
 1
 2
       pictures?
            Presumably.
 3
            So you don't know if that person was perhaps
 4
       checking on someone's ad to see if they were -- what
 5
 6
       they were doing?
                 This data does not allow me to know what the
 7
       Α
 8
       person's intention was.
            And to be clear, the data was -- the data that was
 9
       on 79 -- which is the hard drive --
10
       Α
            Correct.
11
            -- in that computer tower?
12
       Q
13
       Α
            Yes.
            So if, for example, the user was at a hotel and
14
       they wanted to post from the computer tower, they'd also
15
16
       have to bring presumably a keyboard?
            Yes.
       Α
17
       Q
            A mouse?
18
       Α
19
            Yes.
20
       Q
            A monitor?
       Α
            Yes.
21
22
            Quite a bit to lug around in a hotel to connect,
       would you agree?
23
            I would.
24
       Α
25
            So if the user is using a cell phone or an iPad,
       Q
```

that's not going to show up from the data that was in 1 79? 2 No, it is not. 3 Mr. Martino, I take it you are not an employee of 4 backpage.com? 5 6 No, sir, I am not. You don't know quite exactly what their policies 7 8 are as far as retaining information from users or records? 9 No, I do not. 10 You don't know why they might keep deleted photos 11 Q as part of advertisements? 12 13 Α No, I do not. There was some mention about IP addresses earlier 14 15 in your testimony, I believe. Am I correct? Yes, you are. 16 And I believe you agreed with the proposition that 17 if an IP address is owned by the hotel, the hotel isn't 18 going to be able to go further and say that IP address 19 20 was used in Room 102 to Mr. Martino; is that correct? That is correct. 21 Α And the IP address is not going to tell you if 22 force was used? 23 24 Α No.

An IP address is not going to tell you if fraud was

25

Q

used? 1 2 Α No. It's not going to tell you coercion was used? 3 Α No. 4 I want to return to -- or I am going to show you 5 6 50 -- 50D. We talked a little bit about the photos in this Backpage advertisement, and I want to go to 50B. 7 8 MR. GRADY: And if we could go to the next Okay, this page is fine. If we can go ahead and 9 split the screen. And on the right side I would like to 10 pull up Government Exhibit 74, Bates 12163. 11 BY MR. GRADY: 12 Now, on 74, am I correct, Mr. Martino, that 13 according to the metadata associated with this photo, 14 that a Samsung SM-G920A was used to take this photo 15 presumably January 2nd, 5:26 p.m. 16 74 is the image to my right, correct? 17 That is correct. Hopefully you can see the 18 highlights that I --19 20 Α Yes, I can. I just wanted to verify. Yes. The metadata that's present in the exhibit 21 22 does indicate that. And to your knowledge there was a Samsung SM-G920A 23 involved as part of this case, correct? 24 25 Α That is correct.

In fact, I am holding up Exhibit 77. Would you 1 Q 2 agree this is a Samsung SM-G920A? If you want to look at it --3 From a distance, I would say probably. 4 Yeah. You can go ahead and move that around and 5 6 confirm whether that's a Samsung SM-G920A. 7 Yes, I would agree. Α 8 Okay. So would you agree, Mr. Martino, that -- and I know we can't say for sure, that perhaps this camera 9 took this picture on January 2nd, 2016? It's possible. 10 It's possible. Α 11 Okay. Assuming that that is possible, would you 12 0 13 say then that -- from what it appears in 50B-002, that if this picture was taken on here, it was not perhaps 14 saved to the hard drive until February 1st, 2016? 15 I don't believe the created date is present on --16 Sure. Well, I think -- I think it's in 17 Exhibit ZZ8, is the defense -- the spreadsheet that you 18 created? 19 20 You're referring to the picture bottom left of this exhibit, labeled "My Cars 3504"? 21 Yes. The question is, is looking -- we can scroll 22 through 50B a little bit further. There's some --23 So would you -- would you agree that it appears 24 that the picture -- and let's just use My Cars 3508 as 25

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

```
an example. And actually it's listed in your
spreadsheet in ZZ8. It appears that My Cars 3508 is
similar to what is shown in 74, Bates 12163? And that
appears to be the same room, the same bedspread, TV
behind it? The setting seems similar? Would you agree?
     Partially, yes.
     Well, there's a brown door to the top right? I
mean, I know the lighting's a little bit different,
but --
     Yeah, there are visual similarities. Yes.
     Visual similarities?
Q
Α
     Sure.
     According to ZZ8, you say that My Cars 3508 was
created on February 1st, 2016. Do you want to look at
it again?
     No. I have it right here. That is correct.
     Okay. Again, going back to the hypothetical:
Assuming this Samsung took the picture that is shown, is
it possible that the picture could have gone from this
phone to the hard drive on February 1st, 2016?
     Well, no. You have connected three disparate dots.
So there is evidence to my right, to the exhibit to my
right, that could have potentially been taken with a
phone of the same make and model.
Q
     Sure.
```

- However, 3508, we don't -- we are not looking at Α 1 2 metadata to support what took that picture. Sure. Well, let's assume for the moment that 3 there's a series of pictures taken of this person on 4 February 2nd, 2016, by this phone. With me so far? 5 6 Yes, yes. 7 Okay. Let's say the cluster of those pictures were 8 then saved onto the hard drive in 79 all on February 1st, 2016. Is that possible? 9 Hypothetically, sure. 10 Well, if it was created on the hard drive, 3508 was 11 created on the hard drive on February 1st, 2016, right? 12 13 Α Yes. And that tells you that it was transferred onto the 14 15 hard drive February 1st, 2016? 16 Α Yes. It's not a hypothetical. If -- if --17 hypothetically speaking, if this 74 is one and the same, 18 perhaps it could have gotten there on February 1st, 19 20 2016, at the same time? Okay, you just said it's not a hypothetical, but 21
  - A Okay, you just said it's not a hypothetical, but hypothetically speaking.

23

24

25

Q Well, we can just disregard it. I don't think we need to go around in circles anymore about this but other than it's possible that the picture taken by this

```
phone was saved onto the computer on February 1st?
1
 2
      Α
            That is possible.
            Now, I want to go back for a minute. You talked
 3
       about image --
 4
                 MR. GRADY: And if we could go to 50D-004.
 5
 6
       I'm sorry, 50B-004.
      BY MR. GRADY:
 7
8
            Okay, we talked a little bit about the images IMG
 9
       3027 versus KK 137. Are you aware if KK 137 has been
      tagged in any fashion?
10
                 I only have the information that's present and
11
      the information that I was provided from the hard drive.
12
13
            Okay. Is it possible for a user to photoshop
       images?
14
            Yes, it is.
15
      Α
            Could that impact metadata?
16
      A It should not.
17
            But it is possible for the user to make changes and
18
      manipulate photos and data?
19
20
      Α
            Yes.
            And to be fair, Mr. Martino, there are other
21
       devices in this case, such as, oh, a tablet, a mini
22
      tablet, that have not been accessed, correct?
23
      Α
            That is correct.
24
25
                 MR. GRADY: We can go ahead and put 50B down.
```

```
BY MR. GRADY:
 1
            And, in fact, sometimes metadata doesn't always
 2
       exist for a certain picture or an image?
 3
            Yes, that is true.
 4
            Mr. Martino, I assume you are not doing this for
 5
 6
       free?
 7
       Α
            No, sir, I am not.
 8
       Q
            You are being paid?
       Α
            I am.
 9
            What is your hourly rate?
10
            $150 an hour.
       Α
11
            Do you get paid more for trial testimony as opposed
12
       Q
13
       to consultation?
       Α
            Actually, yes. Trial.
14
            What's your trial testimony?
15
       Q
            Trial I believe is 225.
16
       Α
            And been here all week?
       Q
17
       Α
            This is day three.
18
            Finally, Mr. Martino, I want to talk to you a
19
20
       little bit about Michael J. Piznarski. Do you remember
       that name?
21
22
            I do not.
            Is it a case you worked on?
23
            Not that I recall, but it's possible. I have
24
25
       worked on a lot of cases.
```

Possible you were the digital examiner in that 1 2 case? Possible. I'm not recalling that name. 3 Do you recall someone who recorded sex acts with --4 without a person's consent or their knowledge? 5 6 I have done several cases like that, but I do recall cases --7 8 Q Sure. -- of that nature. Α 9 This one happened about six years ago. 10 Again, I'm in the police department at that time. 11 I'm working dozens of cases simultaneously. 12 13 Do you recall searching the defendant's laptop and finding videos that he recorded of sexual encounters 14 with the victim without her knowledge? 15 I don't recall this name, so I really am not 16 comfortable saying anything. 17 Do you recall being in the grand jury when the 18 victim testified? 19 20 MS. SEN: Objection, your Honor. THE COURT: Well --21 I think this is getting a little far 22 MS. SEN: afield. 23 THE COURT: Yeah. Can you give him some clue 24 to identify the case in which he worked, if he worked on 25

this. 1 2 MR. GRADY: Sure. BY MR. GRADY: 3 Do you remember there being an appellate decision 4 about irregularities in the Michael Piznarski case? 5 I don't remember Mike -- the name Michael 6 7 Piznarski, so I can't talk about the case. 8 Q Is it a rule that you should not be present in a grand jury when someone else is testifying? 9 Yes. 10 Do you remember violating that rule? 11 Q Α No. 12 You don't recall an appellate opinion, People 13 versus Piznarski, New York opinion, where it said that 14 Examiner Anthony Martino should not have been present in 15 the grand jury room when the victim was testifying? 16 Α No. 17 So are you saying that did not happen at all? 18 No, I am saying I don't know anything about -- I --19 20 I don't get involved in appellate court decisions. a forensic examiner. 21 Sure. 22 I have been present in courtrooms and even grand 23 jury testimony, you know, in order to provide technical 24 expertise on many cases. 25

```
You don't recall if that's ever been an issue?
 1
 2
      Α
            No.
            You don't recall an appellate court criticizing you
 3
       for being present in a grand jury when a person is
 4
       testifying?
 5
 6
            I --
                 MS. SEN: Objection, your Honor.
 7
       testimony here has nothing to do with being the
8
       examiner --
 9
                 THE COURT: Yes.
10
                 MS. SEN: I don't think that --
11
                 THE COURT: Objection overruled. You can
12
       answer it, and then I think that should be the final
13
       answer, and you can move on to the next topic.
14
                 MR. GRADY: Okay, your Honor. No further
15
16
       questions.
                 THE COURT: Oh, okay.
17
            All right. Ms. Sen, do you have any further
18
       questions?
19
20
                 MS. SEN: No, your Honor.
                 THE COURT: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Martino.
21
22
                 THE WITNESS:
                               Thank you, your Honor.
                 (Witness excused.)
23
                 THE COURT: All right, defense call the next
24
25
      witness?
```

MR. KAPLAN: Judge, may we approach? 1 THE COURT: Yes. 2 (The following was held at the bench.) 3 MR. KAPLAN: What do you want to talk about, 4 Judge? 5 THE COURT: Want to talk about whether you are 6 7 going to call your client? 8 MR. KAPLAN: Well, can we talk about that in the morning? It's been a long day. 9 THE COURT: Huh? 10 MR. KAPLAN: It's been a long day. Your law 11 clerk's tired. 12 THE COURT: I see. Well, tell me what -- you 13 have to talk to him? 14 MR. KAPLAN: I do have to spend some time with 15 him. We had an issue come up with the Tatro matter that 16 needs to be resolved before we can go any further, so --17 not -- just between him and me, not between anybody 18 else. 19 20 It's only -- if he were to testify, you'd have to ask the jury to leave anyway so he could get on the 21 stand because he doesn't want to be --22 THE COURT: No, I appreciate that. But it 23 is -- you know, this is -- this is a little unfair to 24 the government because on the one hand, I understand 25

minutes early.

that you don't have to tell them whether you are going to call your client in general, but now we are going to the eve of the summations. But are you telling me -- you telling me you don't know the answer as to whether he is going to testify?

MR. KAPLAN: No, no, I am not saying that.

THE COURT: Oh. Okay. What are you saying?

MR. KAPLAN: I'm saying that I thought it

would be a good time to break. It's only like 20

THE COURT: Okay. All right?

MR. DARROW: So would it -- I infer from what Mr. Kaplan just said that he has decided whether or not he is going to call his client. I think the government should be informed. It's the day before closing arguments and summations. We have been waiting day after day.

THE COURT: You know, in general, I really appreciate that you don't have to tell the government as to whether --

MR. KAPLAN: I don't mind saying that as it looks right now, I am going to call him. I could come in in the morning and not do it, I suppose. I have gotta spend some time with him, but I have always told Mr. Darrow, "You should be ready to cross him," you

know. 1 THE COURT: Okay. So what you are saying 2 right now, to the best of your ability, you think --3 MR. KAPLAN: I would like to call him. 4 THE COURT: That he's going to testify? 5 MR. KAPLAN: Right. 6 7 THE COURT: Okay. All right? I quess we'll 8 call it a day, and I'll speak with you a little bit more. Okay. 9 MR. DARROW: Thanks. 10 THE COURT: But you are on notice that he 11 is -- okay. Thanks. 12 13 (The following was held in open court.) THE COURT: All right. It's -- before the 14 next witness, we should call it a day. So I am going to 15 16 let you go at 10 after. We'll begin at nine o'clock. In general, it may very well be that you will get the 17 case tomorrow or maybe not. It's unclear at this point. 18 So if it's possible and you do get the case, then you 19 20 will have the ability to impact the schedule, so if we go past 4:30, you can call that. So if any way you can 21 22 make alternative arrangements for your personal responsibilities so that you would be free after 4:30, 23 that would be helpful, but I am not suggesting one way 24 25 or another as to whether you will get the case tomorrow

or not. You may, or it may be the following day. 1 All right. And again, I want to remind you not to 2 say anything about this case to anyone, and we will see 3 you tomorrow morning. And I am going to stay and talk 4 with the lawyers. 5 6 (The jury was excused after which the following was held 7 in open court at 4:13 p.m.) 8 THE COURT: All right. If the defense calls additional witnesses, then we will continue with 9 additional witnesses. If the defense does not call 10 witnesses but rests, will there be rebuttal evidence 11 from the government? 12 13 Frankly, I only ask because if there is no rebuttal evidence and no one testifies from the defense, we're 14 heading for summation. 15 MR. DARROW: If the defense closes in the 16 morning, we are not calling anyone following. 17 THE COURT: All right. So you should be 18 prepared for summations. Okay. 19 20 MR. DARROW: Yes, your Honor. THE COURT: That's the first thing. 21 The second thing is, again, on Count 15, we have 22 begun the research. It's -- and we'll continue on. 23 There are, in fact, Fifth Circuit case -- actually, 24 what's sort of helpful is the research into the 25

congressional background into the change in 2015.

Apparently Congress was concerned not with situations like this in which young people are called to have photographs taken and Backpage used.

Apparently the motivation for the change was to address all the money that was being made by Backpage. In fact, Backpage sued Congress for violation of the First Amendment, and lost essentially. So the focus is less about protecting young women, or girls; it's more about making sure that companies were not profiting large amounts in advertising. So as a result, if one is aiding and abetting by getting women to have pictures taken and then posted on Backpage, then they could be prosecuted for that.

There are a number of cases before that. In fact, there's obviously a Second Circuit case, which is not a reported case; there's also an Eleventh Circuit case, not reported case; a four -- Fifth Circuit case as well, all of which suggests that in situations like this when minors are used for photographs to post on something like Backpage, that that actually can be conceived of as aiding and abetting. It's under an aiding and abetting theory, but also, I think, slightly confirms the government's position that the law in 2015 was not significantly changed in regard to advertising when you

are talking about young persons participating in advertising and that being related to aiding and abetting a commercial act, or maybe even the photographing and posting being a commercial act.

So my question initially was this: You know, what is -- in particular, Hannah -- is actually posting photos that were of her with these other persons a commercial act? Or was it not? If the commercial act is just the actual act of prostitution, well, there's very little evidence that she participated in prostitution.

If the commercial act is actually posting her image, then it's a stronger argument to say that she participated in a commercial act as a result of enticing or force or coercion from others. I mean, that was essentially the debate in my mind.

You know, it seems that there are cases out there prior to 2015 which address this issue, and they add this element of aiding and abetting. So then I went back to the indictment, and indeed aiding and abetting is included within Count 15. So the question is whether aiding and abetting others in prostitution would satisfy the statute. Anyway. And I'm telling you this because I'd like a memorandum on either these cases or this issue in general, and you should know what we found.

So I'd ask that -- you know, that both of you --1 both sides submit briefing as to whether the status of 2 the evidence that she had these images taken from 3 photographs and posted on Backpage -- and there's very 4 little evidence to suggest that she was engaged in 5 6 prostitution, is that sufficient to meet the statute? 7 Any questions at all? 8 MR. DARROW: Perhaps if the parties had the citations to those cases, your Honor, it would move us 9 along in the analysis. 10 THE COURT: Yes. I would be glad to get the 11 citations from the person who has the citations. I just 12 13 have the summaries. Okay. All right. Anything from the defense? 14 15 MS. SEN: No, your Honor. I will brief it for you. 16 THE COURT: All right. Okay. 17 All right. So the decision is made whether we have 18 more testimony or not tomorrow. If not, we go into 19 20 summations. Now, when would you like a copy of the charge? 21 can get that prepared in half an hour. Would you like a 22 copy? There have been some minor changes, and I'm 23 reviewing now the three requests that you have made. 24

MR. KAPLAN: You want us to review it with the

25

Court today or just e-mail it to us and we will get it 1 2 in the morning? THE COURT: We will e-mail it to you. 3 I mean, you have already reviewed it and said there are no 4 objections, but there are a couple of changes, frankly. 5 For instance, immunized witnesses; were there any 6 immunized witnesses? I didn't remember any. 7 8 MS. SAVNER: Well, Keisha Willard did have letter immunity, but that was not, I believe, raised. 9 THE COURT: It was never mentioned. 10 MS. SAVNER: No. 11 THE COURT: So the question is whether you 12 want an instruction on immunized witnesses, and I 13 just --14 MS. SAVNER: We don't think it's necessary 15 given that it wasn't a fact at issue. 16 THE COURT: Okay. All right. 17 MS. SAVNER: And another question, your Honor: 18 In terms of a copy of the indictment, I don't know what 19 20 your practice is. THE COURT: Yes. So -- maybe Judge Crawford 21 does this. Ordinarily I don't do that, and the reason I 22 don't do it is because there's a lot of, some would say, 23 extraneous material in a Count 1 conspiracy indictment. 24 And so generally the charge has -- the charge includes 25

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

the charges, and I take actually the first two paragraphs of the conspiracy count, and then the other counts, they're grouped into sections. 3, 5, 7, 8 and 9 I think are all grouped in one particular -- and we go through all of those. And actually they're read in the charge. So I don't actually submit the indictment itself -- anyway -- in case there's any objection. And 10 through 15, I go through each one of those charges in the charge and read actually the charge and then define it. And the same with 16. MS. SAVNER: So obviously as charged, and I don't remember how it stands in the last version of the jury charge, but we charged Victim A, Victim B --THE COURT: Oh, no, that's all been modified to the names, the first name and the second initial -or first initial. MS. SAVNER: Thank you. THE COURT: I can get this to you fairly quickly, and you can take a look at it and we can talk about it tomorrow. All right? Is there anything else at this point? MS. SAVNER: Not from the government. MR. KAPLAN: No, your Honor. Thank you. THE COURT: All right. Okay. We'll see you tomorrow.

I	I
1	And we will e-mail you the charge. How about that?
2	MS. SAVNER: Your Honor, one more question.
3	THE COURT: Yes.
4	MS. SAVNER: Would you like the briefing
5	e-mailed as well or just filed?
6	THE COURT: If you get it done tonight, I
7	would love to have the have it e-mailed, but if not,
8	I will just read I will get here tomorrow early and
9	read it.
10	MS. SAVNER: Okay.
11	THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.
12	(Court was in recess at 4:24 p.m.)
13	*** ***
14	
15	
16	<u>CERTIFICATION</u>
17	I certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript from the record of proceedings in the
18	above-entitled matter.
19	and held Rierce
20	May 7, 2019 Date Anne Nichols Pierce
21	Aime Nichols Fierce
22	
23	
24	
25	